

New England Fishery Management Council
Amendment 16 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP
Public Hearing Summary
Wakefield MA
May 26, 2009

A public hearing was held to receive comments on the draft Amendment 16 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and the accompanying Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The meeting was chaired by Groundfish Oversight Committee Chair Mr. Rip Cunningham, assisted by Council staff Tom Nies and Anne Hawkins. Council member Dr. David Pierce was also present. There were approximately fifty people in attendance, 30 of whom signed the attendance sheet.

After introductions, Council staff provided an overview of the amendment documents (including the public hearing document and the measures matrix), summarized the measures considered in the amendment, and described the comment process and future actions. The public then provided comments on the proposed rule. The comments (with staff responses where given) were:

MA State Senator Bruce Tarr (R-Essex): I appreciate you recognizing me. This will be a brief comment, with a more substantive one at a later time. Thank you for allowing us to have the opportunity for input in the development and adoption of Amendment 16, which I see as critical toward the development of a sustainable fishery. What is before us is the opportunity to present an element of stability, to provide sanity in regard to management measures, and to give far greater self-control to individual fishing vessels and skippers and the crew that operate them. Sector management will do that, but only if we approach it carefully and thoughtfully. We need to think about what we're using for baseline calculations. I also caution you not to lay a regulatory scheme over sector management that will make them unworkable. I hope that will continue to be central to the Council's discussions. Regulations such as rolling closures will make sectors impractical. Thank you again and I look forward to working with you to bring this amendment to fruition, and to enter a new era in fisheries management that is more productive than we've seen in recent years.

Paul Diodati, Director, MA Division of Marine Fisheries: I want to thank you, Mr. Cunningham, as the Chair of the Groundfish Committee. You have had the most challenging task, compared to previous chairs, with respect to bringing the Council to this transition point. Other members of the Council should be congratulated and Council staff as well. This is a very complicated piece of work and your job is not going to be easy in weeks to come. I will say that the governor is very much in support of bringing fisheries to a sustainable condition, and very much in favor of transitioning to catch shares. The division will provide formal comments in writing to the Council and NMFS, so I will not say more at this time, but I appreciate the work that has gone into this important effort.

Jackie Odell, Executive Director, Northeast Seafood Coalition: We plan on submitting more extensive comments, so I just wanted to raise a couple of points now. First, on the

topic of PSCs, we just received the information last week for permit holders about what the PSC would be under the different allocation formulas considered in A16. We are not able to determine what amount of fish that equals because we won't know the TAC until next fall. After a very preliminary review, we are not sure we have a satisfactory allocation alternative and are not sure the fishery is able to handle the dual system we're about to create. The common pool could potentially have a lot of DAS with no quota in addition to sectors. The reality of the allocation on the fishery, for both sectors and the common pool, is not being taken into consideration. The second item I would like to address is setting ACLs. As we've watched the MSA process in the last few years with layers of precaution being added to the setting of TACs, we are concerned that the fishery will be starved of quota, and that will make sectors fail. There are so many layers of uncertainty, in addition to other factors such as the discard to kept ratio, the recreational and commercial allocation, and other fisheries bycatch, that by the time you look at an ACL for the directed groundfish fishery we'll be starved of quota and sectors will potentially fail because of that. The third item I would like to address is the option to allow transfer of quota. It is critical to allow transferability. Nobody, regardless of the allocation formula, will receive the allocation they need to go out and operate. It is very important that they can transfer among them and between sectors. I would like to add, though it's not in the document, that to allow sectors and individuals to be able to trade their quota, we need something in the document about freezing catch history so that people don't build their history on top of transferred quota. In Amendment 13, people thought that catch history went with the vessel that caught fish, and DAS went to vessels that leased days. People would have thought more closely about that if they realized how it would affect them, and we need to be careful going forward

Dave Marciano, Gillnetter (Gloucester, MA): First and foremost, I want to point out that consolidation is a politically correct way to say elimination. That's exactly what is happening. This is a question of who's being eliminated, and who is not. Just look at the operating costs of a sector. It's single operators that are being excluded from participation. You heard all of my comments at the Council meeting. If your homes are paid for and your kids are out of school, you are paying for the permits to continue operating. If you're in the opposite position, you're out of the fishery. That impact goes further than just the boat. It's about taking people out of their homes and putting them in the streets. Owning a permit at one point got us into the fishery, but bagging groceries won't keep us in our homes. If we are talking about making business decisions, the decision is simple: I sell out and hope to get enough to keep my shirt, which is unlikely. That being said, there's a lot to be said for history only. There is a great argument to that. There should be another PSC option where you consider DAS for stocks of fish caught. That being said, knowing that I'm finished upon implementation, I need to get as much as I can to keep my shirt. The boat needs to be paid off, and you have the issue of paying for your house. The options for employment in this day and age are unfortunate. For the common pool AM, a hard TAC is a negative because it creates derby fisheries. Reducing DAS in the following year is a better solution. For monitoring – if this helps bring the cost down, obviously there is a minimal amount of monitoring necessary to make it viable for you as managers, but 100% coverage is excessive. If you can bring the costs down by half, that's where you need to focus. The costs are too excessive for a small

boat. Again, the options for common pool effort control measures are disappointing. I support Option 2A. I was a big supporter of 24 hour DAS, and there were a lot of unresolved issues. The unfortunate thing is that all we ever heard at the Committee level were all the negatives associated with DAS, but with a few years of development, there was never a desire to fix the problems and we never resolved the issue. Instead, the desire was to keep DAS as bad as possible so you would appreciate sectors or quotas.

Steve Welch, Commercial Fisherman: On the CCCHFA website, there was a worksheet on allocating the stocks of what we have. Was that accurate based on the information we just got in the last few weeks?

Mr. Nies: I haven't reviewed the spreadsheet in the last few weeks. The original correctly calculated the permit shares over the last few years. The conversion of percentages to pounds landed is less certain. The CCCHFA sheet used approximate catch levels that we wrote in the document. It gives you a good idea of the relative differences, but probably not the exact numbers of pounds you will get.

Mr. Welch: It is hard to comment since we don't know where we will stand when this is all played out. I will do my best to appease this process. Looking at what I got from NMFS in the last few weeks, I believe that PSC Option 2 would be my best option for a few reasons. One is rolling closures we put up with when we started protecting codfish. As a trip gillnet fishermen, I was given 50 nets on Georges Bank, even though we had the smallest discard rate of the entire fleet. I had to eliminate 2/3 of my gear. That really affected my fishing operations, and not just my own but other peoples' also. For me it would be beneficial to do the 50/50 split with stocks caught. We keep talking about the fishermen as the cause of problems, not the environment. At some point in the future you have to talk about dogfish and harbor seals. They're a nuisance and I'm not just pointing my finger like some fishermen are doing. The abundance will keep us at a very low limit.

Ed Barrett, President, MA Bay Groundfish Fishermen's Association: Most of our federally-permitted boats are preliminarily enrolled in sectors. We have obviously been looking over the options and having discussions over the preferred alternative. At this point, as people have received their information, they're just starting to be able to digest it and have questions about the different allocation formulas. At times we've had theoretical consensus, but until the hard figures are made known, the rubber hasn't hit the road. This has changed how people are thinking. Previously, most of us have not had GOM haddock landings because of the rolling closures. Options that will provide us with an allocation of that will be preferred. As we look at the small TAC attached to that, even under those options we won't get much of an allocation. There are very small limits. We are starting to get into another situation that existed prior to Amendment 13 – recreational and party charter landings will be significantly higher than commercial landings because of the options under the sector allocations and the PSCs. With those issues in mind, I have a question about the example PSC calculation: is that history the total vessel landings for 10 years, or the average?

Mr. Nies: It is the average annual catch.

Mr. Barrett: We will come forward with written comments. I can say that people are starting to go the other way in regard to sector enrollment. Seeing the hard numbers, they are thinking that the common pool will be viable. Option 2A would probably be our preferred alternative, but I would like to leave our recommendation open for written comments. Thanks for the clarification and for the opportunity to speak.

Mayor Carolyn Kirk (Gloucester, MA): I am here to show the support of the city for the commercial fishermen of Gloucester. I also want to let you know that the eyes of the community are on this process. The decisions this panel makes will have a significant impact on the lives of Gloucester fishermen and the lives of those throughout the Commonwealth. In terms of the options, we look to the commercial fishermen themselves to guide us as leaders of the community and will continue to let them do that. Thank you for this opportunity and for listening to the concerns of the community.

Roger Brisson, Handgear Category A Fisherman (Danvers, MA): There are not too many of us – about 30 in Gloucester – and only a handful that fish in the area seriously for a living. I have a few comments. Two of the three effort control options raise our trip limit to 750 lbs. I like that. We're allowed to use 250 hooks as it is now. I would like to change that to 500 – it would be helpful to catch our fish. Also, in the rules now, you have to use a hand-held tub trawl. It would be nice to use a mechanical device, since I'm getting old. I probably have no choice but to be in the common pool since I can't afford to join a sector. Since Handgear Category A is basically a sector in itself, and we catch less than 1% of all groundfish landings with hardly any bycatch or discards, we should be allowed to be in a rolling closure so we don't have to go as far in the winter. You don't hear much from people in my category. I don't know why they don't come to meetings. I know you guys are really up against the wall, but try to remember there are a handful of us who are the smallest guys on the fleet and there is practically no problem with the fishing that we do. We're easy to control and not in the way. Try to minimize the rules on us so we can make a living. Try to look at us and see what we're doing. We all have small boats and can't go out in bad weather. If you would look at that I would appreciate it.

Toby Lees, Draggerman and Owner, F/V Seel, (New Bedford, MA): I support PSC calculation Option 1 with the long history. When you did the sample calculations, what were the percentages on the species you used?

Mr. Nies: I plugged the percentages into a formula, but I don't have the numbers with me, so I can't tell you what the exact number was. I tried to identify boats from VTRs that fished only in GOM stock areas during the time period and looked at the average landings on these stocks.

Mr. Lees: Some of the paperwork we got mailed shows very small percents. What was the big number you used to get this number?

Mr. Nies: I multiplied those shares by the estimated catch numbers in the amendment document. Those small numbers come out to be something like 20-30,000 lbs. I can show you after the meeting.

Steve Norberg, Martha's Vineyard/Duke's County Fishermen's Association. Thanks to the Committee for listening to our comments. I have nothing specific to say on the options. My thoughts on sectors are that they seem to be the right way to go. Having managers in the actual fishery is a way to make the process quicker. Everyone was encouraged with the steps you were taking, despite the difficulties involved with quota and allocation. I hope the Council takes into account the impacts on small communities. We're a small community, and we have lost most of our boats. We've been fishing since the pilgrims arrived and should have a place in the fishery once the stocks are rebuilt.

Aaron Dority, Project Director, Penobscot East Resource Center (Stonington ME): Thank you for taking my comments today. I would like to raise an issue from the Advisory Panel meeting and offer my support for community fishing associations (CFAs), which are in essence a permit bank, but would ask the NEFMC to recognize a community's right to hold such permits. CFAs could be used to promote conservation or whatever else a community wants to do. I support a freeze like Ms. Odell mentioned. It is critical to know what sort of allocation we have going forward. If the Council reallocates in the future based on different qualifying years, it will add more complexity and confusion than we need. I am concerned about high monitoring costs for small boats. I work with fishermen in Downeast Maine that would catch lobster, scallops, shrimp, and depended on diversity. If monitoring costs are too high, it will be prohibitively expensive. We need to get creative in thinking about ways for the small boat fishery to maintain a place in New England. Perhaps a cap for monitoring expense as a percentage of total revenue for the fishery would be useful. Then, if someone were to spend above that, they could receive an exemption or some other alternative to reduce the cost. In ports such as Southwest Harbor or Jonesport, there are a small number of fishermen and a small volume of fish. That is also true for all communities, regardless of size. Effective management depends on the volume of fish landed in those communities. We need to allow for fishery diversity, maintain large and small boats across New England, and be mindful of this when picking options in this amendment. Encouraging active trade is healthier for the fishery overall. The last thing is that I also support expanding the handgear permits option. Certainly if there is not another alternative and people are being forced out, this may be one option for people to stay in the fishery albeit on a small scale. It would be great if you could add more hooks or consider going even higher with landing limit. In the future, we need to look toward area management with allocations on a finer scale that take into account the abundance or scarcity of specific populations. We need to look at area-specific communities. You should either reactivate category C DAS as stocks rebuild, or create a set-aside for specific gear types. There are communities where stocks have been depleted for years, and people are not getting history for sectors since they are working where there are no fish to catch. Lastly, it is important to allow open access vessels into sectors. The sectors should have the autonomy to decide whether to let those boats in.

Bill Williams, Gillnetter (Gloucester MA): Everybody's having lessons in math here. I look at my PSC numbers and can only talk for myself. The status quo option gives you a snapshot of the last few years. If I had to choose, it would be to use the years 1996-2006, but stocks I'm working on go down substantially, by 30%. The only stocks that go up are some that I don't work on because of the rolling closures. If the rolling closures stay in place and we can't access these fish because of it, I lose again. From the status quo to Option 2, I am down about 65% of the groundfish I've been working on. Option 1 is down by 30%. Options 3 and 4 shouldn't even be considered. We're going to reallocate Gulf of Maine fish. From Options 3 to 4, I see 50% of my GOM cod going away. They're going to Southern New England, and they won't trade or give it back to us. They'll have offshore boats come up through the canal and catch those fish. I was there for the 200 lbs. codfish/year limit, and I don't want to see boats that were on 2000 lbs. of codfish/day while we were doing this coming up and taking this. That is not fair. Option 1 is the fairest, and then we'll see who survives. Thank you.

Tory Bramante, Vessel Owner and Owner, Atlantic Coast Seafood (Boston, MA): About sectors – there is nothing like being thrown in a box with your friends. Hopefully a year from now they will still be talking to you and you will still be in business. I wanted to put a bug in your ear that I hope we're going toward an ITQ. Sectors have a lot of administrative costs. As far as the allocation alternatives, I am teetering back and forth between Options 1 and 2. I haven't figured out which, but I will submit my written comments. I do know that Options 3 and 4 are totally unacceptable and terrible. Lastly, in regard to the tax that was paid on the consolidated permits, there were only a handful of us that made this move as far as I know. I'd like to see if that can be revisited and we can get the loss of our days on that tax back.

Warren Doty, Selectman (Martha's Vineyard, MA). I came with four people from Martha's Vineyard to comment on the creation of sectors. I am concerned about the maintenance of small vessels and small communities. We had four harbors. Edgartown is a yacht haven, Oak Bluffs is a tourist spot, and Vineyard Haven is mostly wooden boats. The only remaining working waterfront is Menemsha. At any time we could change that in favor of yachts and bring much more revenue to the town. We're trying to keep it a fishing community, but we need boats that can switch from one fishery to another and do many things during the course of the year. We need much more activity in terms of finfish. We see the movement toward sectors as a really hopeful sign. We want to be a part of a sector, and see this change as a hopeful idea. We were famous for codfishing, and that fishery disappeared. We would like to see a revival of that fishery. We see the sector as a model for groundfish, but would love to see it as a model for fluke, seabass, and striped bass as well. Several of these are not managed by NEFMC. We would like to see sector management as a boon to our fishery if it could be involved with fluke. We just formed a community fishing association, and would like to see recognition of CFAs in A16. I understand it's been done in some plans on the West Coast, and if that could be recognized and encouraged in A16 it would be helpful to us. There is a lot of concern over moving to hard TACs in New England. We have operated on hard TACs for a long time. The hard TAC on fluke has worked well for Menemsha fishermen. Anybody can

estimate when a closure is coming down the pike. A hard TAC closure could work, and has worked for us with fluke.

Jim Keding, Draggerman (Plymouth, MA). I just got my PSC information last week and am trying to figure out what any of it means. It is hard to choose an option when we don't know what we're going to end up with. We have seven months of rolling closures. I just bought a new boat, and now sectors are coming and I'm going to need a bigger boat. I got my new data in the mail and I lost 100,000 lbs. since the NMFS gave us data a year ago in November. Am I screwed? Pretty much. Nobody can tell me where those landings went. If we do go with sectors, I would like to see the rolling closures gone. We don't need them anymore, not that we needed seven months in the first place. I don't want PSC Options 3 and 4, because I don't want to give away fish we saved for the last 13 years. My head's never spun this much around in a circle. We've taken the brunt of everything, and for people to say boats will come from other areas and wipe us out is totally unacceptable.

Dave Marciano: I just missed one comment about the allocation for recreational measures. I participate in the charter fishery. I think the 1996-2006 allocation for this fishery is appropriate. The simple fact is, wouldn't we all like to fish in a closed area for five years and have allocation based on that? With that fishery, what we don't need is the meat fishermen – the guys who leave with 250 lbs. of filets. I know where that meat goes when they leave. I don't cater to them, but to families who want to have fun and bring a few pounds of fish home. As long as you set fair and appropriate limits, everyone has fun. A lot of guys cater to those meat fishermen, and that's an injustice.

Richard Burgess, Vessel Owner (Manchester, MA): When you get down to the basics of this whole thing and understand how sectors will work, from the start you will see that it takes a ton of money. The guys in this room don't make a ton of money. You don't want to share the fish you've worked a long time for. The only way to make it work is to retain your history from 1996-2006. If you don't retain history, sectors are doomed to failure from the start. It's all about money, feeding your kids, and the paying the bills you have. Thank you.

Craig Porter, Gillnetter (Gloucester, MA). This is just crazy. It's so complicated and costs so much money to run all this stuff. We have all made business decisions throughout this 15-year period. I've worked hard for my history. I could have made different choices and made more money, but we did what we have to do. I have a problem with the recreational allocation. They're going into closed areas and bringing home coolers and coolers worth of filets. Managing with quotas is an easier way to go and would be less expensive. This is mind boggling. I stopped coming to meetings because I couldn't handle it. My eyesight is gone because I can't read this paperwork anymore. I don't want to give fish to guys that come in and pound the middle bank. The quota will go to the South Shore and everybody knows it.

Tom Osmer (Martha's Vineyard, MA). We will be submitting written comments about our special situation on the Vineyard. We are on top of these sector plans and will work

closely with Aaron Dority. I want to speak in favor of CFAs and permit banking which allow for our continued existence on the Vineyard.

Jan Margeson, Gillnetter and Fixed Gear Sector Member (Chatham, MA). We've been fairly successful the last few years working under a sector-based plan. We have stopped discarding fish. Within the sector, we allocated our own fish just from what we brought into the sector, and are essentially working on an ITQ. I wanted to let everybody know it's working fairly well. Thanks.

Joe Orlando, Fisherman (Gloucester, MA): I am kind of disappointed with the letters we got last week. I'm a multiple permit holder and can't digest what those mean. The rolling closures need to be lifted. There is so much fish out there and we're tied up to the dock. I signed up for sectors for that reason – so we can catch the fish we haven't been able to catch for the last 5 or 6 years. That is all I can say at this point – this is very confusing.

Eric Brazer, CCCHFA Policy Analyst and Manager of Two Existing Sectors: We will be submitting formal written comments, but I want to weigh in on a few issues. Allocation issues are one of the most important decisions the Council will make. I applaud the effort of the Advisory Panel today. We support an allocation plan that doesn't take fish away from fishermen who caught it in the past, and that does not give fish to those who didn't catch it. We support a dynamic baseline, and hope the Council treats the existing sectors the way the 17 additional sectors want to be treated in the future. That will provide stability and allow for the creation of a long-term business plan. We support PSC Options 1 and 5. Briefly, it's important for sectors to be able to trade and transfer quotas as long as that doesn't negatively impact the health of the resource. The monitoring issue has been contentious and heated, but I see this as an opportunity to provide a program outside of the scope of the NMFS to provide transparent and high-quality data. We need more decisions based on more accurate data. The Monitoring Working Group worked very hard to develop a standards document for dockside monitoring that we hope the council and NMFS will comment on and approve at the upcoming meeting. This will cost money. NMFS is stepping up and providing money to sectors to cover some of this. Under sector plans, fishermen will be more profitable and making more money. As such, we recommend 100% dockside monitoring, and some level of at-sea monitoring that passes the red-face test. The CFA issue, which is also known as permit banks has been touched on. The AP discussed this today, and we recommend that the Council formally recognize these in A16. There are five of them trying to provide sustainable access to fish in the future. We support the expansion of the Hook Gear Haddock SAP, and finally, we support the GOM Sink Gillnet Pilot Program. The program allows targeting of a healthy species while providing high levels of accountability. Thank you and we will submit formal comments by the deadline

Jeff Good, Commercial Fisherman (Plymouth, MA): We have been part of the Cape Cod Bay and Stellwagen Bank. I am not sure which allocation alternative I support, but I will submit written comments with my final decision. What I would like to say is that I do not want to watch Stellwagen Bank get decimated by larger boats as it may have been in the past. After the sacrifices I've made – things could happen where if you make the wrong

choice it could be decimated. I'm confused and uncertain what the right choice is right now.

Russell Sherman, Fisherman (Gloucester, MA): I find this whole process very old and very unfair. I have been in this since 1971, and have been coming to meetings since 1996. When all is said and done, it has just gone from bad to worse. I thought Amendment 13 was bad, but this is the be-all and end-all. I'm out of business. When the currency was DAS, I made an investment. It turned out to be the wrong investment, since now the currency is landings. I hope when all is said and done that the environmental community and NMFS come to muster, and stand up in front of the country, and admit what they have done. The New England groundfish fishery is forever changed, and a way of life is gone, and I hope that goes on record. Thank you.

Steve Welch. I had several comments but I didn't get to them. I don't like public speaking. Eric reminded me when that when you speak for the existing sectors for 1996-2001, they had great history. I also had great history in those years. But I'm forced to choose 1996-2006. He wants a broad base for other sectors, but 1996-2001 for their sector. If they get that time period, I want that too because that will benefit me greatly. Thank you.

Paul Cohan, Fisherman, Cape Ann Gillnetters' Association (Gloucester, MA): I have to make a comment here. We seem to have devolved into a situation based on philosophy rather than looking at the facts. It is somewhat distressing that we have pitted the industry against itself for the failings of previous management. We have really had nothing substantial with which to assess a decision whether to go into the common pool or to join a sector. We have been unable to make an informed decision here. What should be going on in the bigger picture is a process of restoration rather than elimination. Elimination is where we have headed for a long time – devaluation of permits, leasing permits, and eliminating participants for lack of participation. Several things have gone into this level of consolidation. The only winners will be the people with the most dough. We will be haggling over handfuls of small amounts of fish. We are trading them as if on the commodities market. This is a public resource. Why is any government agency allowed to privatize access to a commonly-held resource? Why is anyone in a position to start taking arbitrary numbers and assigning them to vessels, sectors, ports, or anything that would give them access to this public resource? Why take this approach? Why not go back to a time when the fishery was operating within its own equilibrium – before the introduction of DAS and rolling closures. While I admit there were deficiencies in harvesting mechanisms – retention and escapement. It seems strange to me that NMFS has blown all this information away and has decided that we have not done our job. I believe they are trying to take a lot of scrutiny and slap that down onto the sectors. Now sectors will fight it out with each other for the last fish that is available. It is a drag that we have this new flag – that the petrol-eco-consortium is funding the switchblades we will use to knife each other. Why are we doing this? This is such a harebrained scheme. It is unprecedented. I will not sing any songs tonight. It is just so wrong in its inception. We are looking at elimination – not restoration – if we can get few enough people involved, it doesn't matter if we get more fish. What matters is how will get them and how much

dough they will they have to access those fish. It will be easier for the fishery system to keep going on, especially if they have eco-petro-people. It is difficult to someone like me, who has believed in the system, and worked through it – I would need a bigger truck to carry the paper I have got. It is all a bunch of hogwash. No one was provided with enough information before they were forced to sign into the sectors. Also, sectors are based on a handful of alternatives. There are big questions on this that I won't get into right now. We have the best of two options: would you like a hot steak or a cold chop? Would you like to be burned at the stake or have your head cut off? Either one is a bad idea. You will watch communities, gears, and individual vessels wind up in a slugging match for entitlement. And it is entitlement of a publicly held resource. Who makes this decision? Who hands this out to a bunch of hipper-than-thous with a little more dough? We heard about overcapitalization from the start. This opens the door to more of that. It is speculation on sole rights to harvest a commercial commodity that thousands of people sacrificed to rebuild who are now being left on the outside. They have nothing left to sacrifice. This is where you will see the big money come in. This is when you will see mega-corporations of the fishery. It is interesting that people are not afraid of what is going on. That's about it. This is the worst thing I have seen in 30 years of participation in this process. I can't believe anyone has the good conscience to do anything but vote this down. I realize that we are dealing with a kangaroo court here. This is why I haven't been here for the last 8 or 10 years – you really can't make a difference. The individual and group can't make a difference. This is a preordained decision before I even got here. This gets me right to the core. This keeps me awake at night. This is so wrong and so unjust. Not that I will make any difference. That is why you won't get a song out of here tonight.